



AS we approach the final decade of the present century, the economic outlook for Britain is one of barely concealed gloom. From whom do we get this information? Why, the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the present Tory Government, Mr. John Major. In a speech to the House of Commons last month, Mr. Major confessed that 1990 is going to be a 'tough year' for the country. Interest rates are likely to stay outrageously high, hitting home-buyers everywhere. Mr. Major acknowledged that the nation faces a new round of escalating pay demands, prompted by the Government's failure to control inflation. Treasury experts predict a year of virtually no economic growth, and indeed the risk of a dangerous recession if present trends continue. It is also expected that unemployment, after experiencing a downturn in the last year or so, will shoot up again — possibly by 150,000 in the coming year.

Prospects in the longer term are no better. At the beginning of the present decade, the Tories had been in power just a few months. They had inherited a ramshackle industrial structure, containing a great many firms that were hopelessly inefficient and uncompetitive. In the ten years since that time they have made things, not better, but far, far worse. Huge chunks of British manufacturing capacity have simply been destroyed. Now, whenever there is a loosening up of monetary controls and people are encouraged to spend more, they spend it on predominantly foreign-made goods — making our balance of payments ever worse. The Thatcherite 'revolution' that was heralded as a great scheme for the regeneration of British industry has proved an almost total failure. The chill wind of competition that was supposed to stimulate British firms to become more competitive has, in general terms, not had that effect at all. Our manufacturing capacity is

appalling results this has had for our balance of payments has to some extent been hidden by our exports of North Sea oil. As everyone knows, however, the oil is not going to last for ever, and as exports in that sector decline the full effect of our

Outlook for the 1990s...



CHANCELLOR MAJOR
Admits British economy is in appalling mess

GLOOM OVER BRITAIN

Even Chancellor admits 'tough times' ahead

In the 1990s Britain is going to pay an appalling price for the manner in which the present Government has allowed the nation's manufacturing base to be destroyed. This is going to be reflected in a growing balance-of-payments problem and the almost certain return of skyrocketing unemployment, as masses of workers will have no goods to produce because the Government prefers Britain to obtain those goods from cut-price foreign manufacturers, particularly in the Far East. There is of course only one

Contd. on page 7

Insolvencies 'gathering momentum'

TELL-TALE HEADING

More and more British companies are going bust under the Thatcher Government, as this item from the financial section of the Sunday Telegraph indicates. And don't forget — the ST is a pro-Government paper!

now far smaller than it was at the beginning of the 1980s. While a few branches of industry have become more cost-effective — at the price of appalling levels of redundancies for their workforces — the overall effect of the Thatcherite 'revolution' has been to make British industry much weaker than it was at the time the Tories took over in 1979.

disastrous trading policies will come home to us.

Tories have attempted to mollify the voters by claiming that the decline in manufacturing can be offset by the growth of 'service industries', such as banking, insurance, consultancy work, etc., in which Britain has some undoubted skills. However, the truth is that these industries can never employ more than a tiny section of the nation's workforce, and they are anyway ultimately dependent on manufacturing. If a country does not produce real wealth, measured in terms of goods, there simply isn't anything there to service.


NET IMPORTER

One measure of the colossal failure of Thatcherite economic policy is the fact that, during the Thatcher years, Britain has become, for the first time ever, a net importer of manufactured goods. The

AS THE NATION GROWS TIRED OF MAGGIE, THE TORY KNIVES COME OUT

THE SQUALID OPPORTUNISM that runs right through Tory Party politics has been well demonstrated over this past month, as, with Mrs. Thatcher's public rating taking a steep downturn, her former 'loyal' colleagues have been sharpening their knives in a behind-the-scenes power struggle in which the aim is clearly to deprive her of the party leadership.

The plotters include some who only a short time ago were ostentatiously licking the shoes of the Premier so as to win her and her supporters' approval. Now that



Heseltine



Baker



Ridley



Howe

they detect that her hold over the party and country is not what it used to be, they are only too willing to join the anti-Thatcher forces.

According to a *Daily Mail* report last month, not only is Mr. Michael Heseltine casting his eyes on the Thatcher throne, so also are former toadies like Kenneth Baker, Nicholas Ridley and Sir Geoffrey Howe turning against the Premier.

Baker of course fancies himself as a candidate for the No. 1 post as well as does Heseltine. Ridley and Howe are both sore at Mrs. Thatcher for having recently sacked them from their cabinet posts. In addition, present Foreign Secretary and recently failed Home Secretary Douglas Hurd is reported to be disenchanted with the state of things and likely to back a party rebellion. The report said that Mrs. T. could now only count on the support of the new Home Secretary.

retary Cecil Parkinson, Home Secretary David Waddington and Treasury chief Norman Lamont.


Heseltine's personal antipathy to the Prime Minister, and his insatiable personal ambition, are of course well known. But for Thatcher 'loyalists' such as Baker, Ridley, Howe and Hurd to be opposed to her is something of a revelation — though not entirely a surprise to those of us who have the measure of the types who gravitate to Tory (and Labour) high office.

Of course, the grounds for these men's opposition to Maggie are pretty flimsy, since they all (apart possibly from Heseltine) more or less acquiesced in the policies she has been pursuing for the past ten years. They are all champions of the 'free market' economic measures that have ruined British industry. They all support the EEC — even to a greater extent than Mrs. T. does herself. Hurd of course has presided for some years, as Home Secretary, over a Britain in which crime has hit record levels.

All in all, the present buck-passing going on presents a nasty picture.



MRS. T
These days she cannot afford to turn her back on her colleagues



IN THE
HIGH STREET
Shop is British
but goods inside
and cars outside
are foreign

British Nationalist

No. 96 DECEMBER 1989
Editor: John Morse

THE TORY ROAD TO RACIAL RUIN

SOME YEARS AGO Mr. Ray Honeyford was turned into something of a folk hero by the Fleet Street tabloids. He wrote an article for a 'right-wing' Tory magazine in which he described some of the ill effects on the education of British schoolchildren of having to try to learn in classrooms dominated by ethnic minority pupils. At the time, Honeyford was a headmaster in a Bradford middle school.

This chanced to coincide with the Moslem bid for power in Bradford. As part of their agenda, the Asian immigrant community were demanding that Moslem ideas and values be imposed on local schools.

Mr. Honeyford found himself on the receiving end of a campaign by militant Asians because he had apparently stood up for the rights of British schoolchildren against the ethnic minority demands, all pushed under the guise of 'anti-racism'. He was seen by British parents and public as something of a champion on their behalf and that of our children.

Daily on arrival, Mr. Honeyford was greeted by baying mobs gathered outside his school denouncing him as a 'racist' and demanding his dismissal from his post. Not long afterwards, this campaign of intimidation, mounted by Bradford's militant Asians, was rewarded with success. Mr. Honeyford, under pressure from the local education authority, resigned.

Much water has flowed under the bridge since then. Not so long ago it was even rumoured that Mr. Honeyford might enter politics as a Tory parliamentary candidate.

So far nothing more seems to have come of this. But this in no way has anything to do with Honeyford ever having been a true 'racist', and therefore beyond the Tory pale. In fact, Honeyford himself has right from the start been absolutely frank about the real reasons for the stand he took in Bradford. It was no fault of his if the press gave the public the wrong idea.

For Mr. Honeyford was, in reality, never at any time the great white hope of Britain's children which many people came to see him to be. His line never was that he wanted to save them from being merged into a mongrel multi-racial mish-mash — the nightmare future which Britain's present-day political masters have lined up for them.

Quite the contrary. Honeyford's beef with the Bradford Moslems was precisely that the result of yielding to their demands might be that they would end up having separate schools of their own. British parents might move out of areas like Bradford to save their children from forcible brainwashing with Islam in an Urdu-speaking environment. This in turn might end up in separate schooling for Whites and non-Whites.

Mr. Honeyford has always made it plain that he wants the opposite — as much racial inter-mixing in our schools as possible. In a recent letter to the Daily Telegraph, as in other articles and speeches, he spelled all this out.

Once again, he was taking issue with high-profile 'anti-racism', this time on the part of the Commission for Racial

Contd. on page 7

AS GERMANS EDGE TOWARDS UNITY, WHERE DOES IT ALL LEAVE US?

NOW that the rigid barriers between East and West Germany are being lowered, and the people in the East are being given greater freedom, everyone is talking about the prospect of Germany ceasing to be two countries and again becoming one.

As many politicians and journalists have noted, such a unified Germany will be without any doubt the strongest country in Europe. West Germany, as she is now, is already this — by virtue of her economic strength, which eclipses those of Britain, France and Italy — countries of similar size. With East and West Germany brought together, a new state will emerge with a population of some 78 millions. In the course of time, West Germany's economic dynamism will spread eastwards — after all, the people in the DDR are of the same race; only the stagnant nature of their political and economic system has hindered their development. The result of all this will be a Germany far, far stronger than her Western European neighbours.

And in the longer term Austria too may join this new Germany. The vast majority of the Austrians are ethnic Germans, and there is no reason for them to be divided from their kinfolk indefinitely.

EUROPEAN PANIC

All this is creating a panic among the other European nations, including our own. For one thing, it has thrown the Common Market into total confusion. If there is a single Germany, will it be a member of the Market or not? If it is, it will be easily the most powerful member and will largely call the tune in Market councils. Chancellor Kohl assures us that such a Germany would not try to do this — he must give such an assurance, for international diplomacy demands it. But the realities of power have a way of prevailing over the sweet talk of politicians. The likes of Herr Kohl will not necessarily always be ruling Germany; other, tougher and more nationalistic, leaders could well take over in the future.

On the other hand, if a single Germany is not part of the EEC it will, presumably, be neutralist — not part of any international bloc but an independent, sovereign power in its own right. A great many European politicians, including British ones, do not like this prospect either.

So what should Britain's response be to the prospect of a reunited Germany?

The first thing that we must recognise is that present developments in Germany make a nonsense of British policy throughout the 20th century, and particularly the policy of the past 30-40 years.

We went to war in 1914-18 and again in 1939-45 in order to curb German power on the Continent, to prevent Germany becoming too dominant.


And at the end of all this — after the slaughter of vast numbers of our finest men on the battlefield — this policy has failed. Germany is again going to dominate Europe, if not immediately then before very long.

After World War II we made our next disastrous mistake. We opted to ditch our Empire and Commonwealth and submerge ourselves in a united Europe — under the ridiculous illusion that we could play a leading part in that Europe and fashion its policies to suit our own interests.

Before the latest developments in Germany there was ample evidence that this course was a mistake, a catastrophic mistake. Britain has got nothing from her membership of Europe but economic ruin and increasing political servitude. The prospect of German unification, and therefore of German power being considerably greater than in the recent past, simply underlines this even further.

BRITISH ATTITUDE TO GERMANY

This paper has never been 'anti-German'. It has never shared the Teutonophobic attitudes of some



JUNCTION OF THE TWO GERMANIES
Before too long they will be one

sections of opinion in Britain. We do not believe that a future German super-power would be a military menace to our country — for the very good reason that such a Germany would not have the slightest interest in so being.

As for the question of Germany being the dominant power on the European mainland, whether one thinks this a good thing or a bad thing is neither here nor there; the fact is that it is inevitable. It has always been inevitable. More the pity that we have taken so long, and waded through so much blood, before such a fact has been recognised.

Nevertheless, as British patriots we are obliged by the necessities of the world we live in to look at matters from the British point of view. There can be no honour or self-respect for our own country in being inferior partners in a European union dominated by any foreign country, whether Germany or anyone else.

And, honour and self-respect apart, it would not be in our practical interest to be condemned to such a position. For a start, we would suffer a crushing disadvantage from the economic point of view. German industry would have a considerably larger internal market than our own and thereby be able to achieve greater economies of scale. Germany also has the asset of her central position in Europe, with overland access to most of its trade routes, whereas we stand, seabound, on Europe's periphery.

All these considerations bear out what our paper, and its companion publication *Spearhead* magazine, have said for a long time: that Britain's true interest and true future do not lie in Europe.

That we should seek to be on good terms with Europe goes without saying. That we are racially and culturally part of Europe also goes without saying. Moreover, it is still true that among the nations of Europe there needs to be developed some kind of mechanism of amicable relations that will reduce to the minimum the prospect of more ruinous European wars, such as the two from

which we have suffered during this century.

But that is another thing entirely from saying that Britain should bind herself to Europe in political or economic union.

ALTERNATIVE TO THE E.E.C.

Britain has always had an alternative to immersion in an integrated Europe: this alternative is to renew our old partnership with the white countries of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth as it is should certainly be scrapped — we called for this last month in our summary of the latest ludicrous Commonwealth conference. But we should not scrap our ties with the Commonwealth's white members: Australia, New Zealand and Canada; we should try to strengthen them.

And out of such strengthened ties we should form an entirely new association. It may be better not to call it 'Commonwealth', for that name has become rather discredited. However, the name is of secondary importance; it is the substance of the thing that matters.

All the politicians and all the newspapers will of course say that this is no longer possible. The white countries of the Commonwealth have deserted us and we cannot now win them back, they will claim.

But of course they would say this, wouldn't they? They are all committed to railroading us ever more deeply into Europe. They are all internationalists who want to see Britain surrender its nationhood!

The truth is that it has been not so much a matter of our old Commonwealth partners deserting us as of our deserting them. We left them in the lurch when we made our first moves towards joining Europe — back in the 1950s. Of course they have had to form other associations, for we left them no choice.

But those associations can be broken, just as our associations with the EEC can be broken — if the resolve is there and if all of us can be awakened to a realisation of where our best interests

lie.

The countries of the old Commonwealth are still largely primary producers. They trade a great deal in food products and minerals and must export a large portion of their food products and minerals in order to survive.

We, on the other hand, need to import a great deal of food products and minerals and to export manufactured goods in order to pay for them. The basis still exists, therefore, for a strong trading partnership. Our countries have economies that are largely complementary; the nations of Europe do not.

And if we are making comparisons with a united Germany, the combined populations of the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and Canada total nearly 100 million. Of this figure, more than three quarters are of British stock.

So we could, in concert with such countries, form a bloc as large and as powerful as Germany in economic strength — and with much greater natural resources to boot.

But we would operate in areas that would not bring us into conflict. We could leave the Germans to dominate Europe, as they are going to do anyway. Such dominance would not need to affect us, for we would have our interests elsewhere.

This could lead to something that the present century has been all the worse for not having: Anglo-German concord and friendship, with neither side feeling threatened by the other.

SECOND FIDDLE

On the other hand, if we continue to leave our former dominions in the lurch and try to play a role in Europe, we are bound to end up playing second fiddle to Germany — for she has the bigger battalions in Europe than we do — and Europe will be the place where such battalions count.

And in time Britain, and probably France and the others, will get tired of this unfavourable balance of forces and will start to coalesce against Germany again, and we will have all the makings of World War III.

History has some value for us if we learn from our past mistakes. The present situation in Europe shows that the whole of the 20th century has been one big mistake — for all of us but particularly for Britain.

In the 21st century, now only a decade away, we can arrange things better. But it does mean a fundamental change of course. The course mapped out here is in fact the only course that offers this country a future.

It is the correct course to follow in response to the momentous events now taking place in Europe. Let's embark on it while we still can!

JOHN TYNDALL

Mrs. T. wants continued US-Soviet occupation of Europe

MRS. THATCHER has been thrown into a total panic by the prospect that East and West Germany may before too long become united into one nation. Following the recent moves towards freedom in East Germany, the Premier made a public statement after an EEC summit meeting in Paris last month in which she said: "The question of borders is not on the agenda. They should stay as they are, and all military matters must continue to be conducted through NATO and the Warsaw Pact."

The Prime Minister was reported as saying the same thing in a message to Mr. Gorbachev and in a talk with President Bush. According to the *Daily Mail* of November 20th, this "seemed to end speculation that not only would the Americans soon start pulling back some of their 325,000 troops in Europe but that Britain would also have to begin withdrawing the 55,000-strong Rhine Army."

All of which confirms what this paper has said for years: that US and Soviet forces are not in Europe to defend their respective 'democratic' and 'socialist' systems against each other but are there jointly to occupy

Europe itself — as of course was their purpose after the defeat of Germany in 1945.

This must be so because the threat of a Soviet march westwards across Europe is now so obviously non-existent as to make a defensive system against it, maintained at huge expense, utterly ludicrous. The truth is that both powers, together with Britain, acting as the Americans' satellite, have jointly arranged to keep forces in Europe in order to keep the European nations subservient to the 'super-powers'.

The very fact that Mrs. Thatcher would seem to prefer that the Soviets remain in occupation of the East of Germany makes a mockery of her reputation as an 'opponent' of comm-

unism. The truth, it seems, is that she would prefer the Soviets to remain in Europe under the aegis of their 'Warsaw Pact' than to have both them and the Americans leave Europe

Contd. on page 7



Thatcher and French President Mitterrand: both have been thrown into a panic over the prospect of German unification

Why is the British public losing confidence in the police?

BRITAIN'S POLICE, sadly, are losing the confidence of the British public. This is the finding of a recent survey conducted by the Mori organisation. The survey showed that respect for the police has deteriorated alarmingly since the 1950s. Then all but a very tiny portion of the populace (no more than 1 per-cent) confessed lack of confidence in the guardians of the law, while 84 per-cent professed full confidence and 15 per-cent a qualified confidence. Now about 14 per-cent have no confidence, while the remaining 86 per-cent are divided nearly equally between those professing full confidence and those with qualified confidence. And the trend towards reduced confidence in the police is growing.

Undoubtedly, this trend is not unconnected with the huge growth in the coloured immigrant population, in which a far higher than average number manifest attitudes hostile to police. But this would not provide anything like a full explanation.

It remains a fact that less than half the British people of today still have full confidence in their police forces, only a fraction of these people belonging to ethnic minorities.

Our paper is of the opinion that a very large share of the blame for this worsening situation must be placed on the shoulders of the top hierarchy of the police — not the ordinary constables and sergeants, who mostly maintain high standards of policing within the parameters of the orders given to them from above.

One major factor in reducing people's confidence in the police has undoubtedly been the 'softly-softly' police tactics employed against lawbreakers belonging to ethnic-minority communities. If, for instance, police receive information leading to the suspicion that drugs are to be found in a building in a given district, their response will be different depending on whether the district is a predominantly white one or has a large coloured population. If

the latter is the case, police action is likely to be timid in the extreme — because high-ranking police officers upon whose instructions anti-drug operations are carried out are heavily involved in the politics of 'race relations' and are desperately anxious to avoid riots. And when riots do break out, police action against the offenders is likely to be much less tough than, for instance, action against football hooligans — the difference lying in the fact that inner-city rioters are mainly black while football hooligans are mainly white.

Any kind of policing which involves unequal criteria of law enforcement for different types of people is liable to lead to reduced confidence in the police forces. Policing must at all times be seen to be strictly impartial.

Mr. Ivor Benson, writing in his newsletter Behind the News last month, came close to the truth when he said:-

"The morally anomalous situation in which the policeman often finds himself is compounded by a widening gulf of mutual misunderstanding between senior officers and men in the lower ranks. Candidates for the top positions are now drawn increasingly from the universities rather than from the lower ranks, as before. This has resulted in a preponderance of 'armchair' policemen in the most senior positions, more influenced by the sociology, etc., which they learned as students than by lessons of practical experience and of long experience of the public in general."

Mr. Benson has here hit the nail right on the head. The fact is that today a growing number of top police chiefs come from a background which has made them into obedient 'liberals', eager to toe the line laid down by the political establishment to which they owe their positions. This leads to increasing alienation between these

chiefs and the men serving under them.

This trend would also explain recent grossly unjust police actions against the British National Party in some places where the party has attempted, by fully law-abiding methods, to exercise its right of assembly, and been prevented from doing so on the spurious grounds that the BNP is a threat to 'public order'.

Ultimately, the responsibility for this deteriorating situation must lie with our political leaders, who have made this unhappy circumstance come about by the manner in which they have used their power and influence to secure the appointment of senior police chiefs, not on the basis of merit, but out of political and ideological favouritism — all the time giving preference to liberal establishment toadies rather than men with sound records as firm practitioners of law-enforcement and fighters against crime.

JAMES THURGOOD

SO — IF YOU DON'T LIKE MODERN ARCHITECTURE, YOU'RE A 'NAZI'!

BRIAN FORD
comments

ARE YOU one of those who feel revulsion against the disfigurement of our town and city centres by hideously shaped skyscraper blocks and other monstrosities of modern 'architecture'? If so, you are a 'Nazi'!

This is the inference we must draw from an extraordinary attack on Prince Charles recently made by a leading member of the architectural profession.

The Prince, as some readers will know, is a strong critic of modern architecture and has frequently spoken out against the landscapes of ugliness that it has created. In this we entirely support him, though we have had occasion to be deeply critical of him on some other issues.

But according to Professor Colin St. John Wilson, former head of architecture at Cambridge University, Prince Charles' approach to modern design are "a throwback to Hitler's Germany."

Another supporter of modern architecture to condemn the Prince in the same way was Martin Pawley, a writer and consultant to organisations including the United Nations, who said that the Prince's descriptions of modernism were "reflections of the phrases the Nazis used about modern buildings."

For our own part, we are sure that




PRINCE CHARLES
Smeared as a 'Hitlerite' because he opposes concrete ugliness

HRH The Prince would be most offended to be likened to the Nazis and Hitler, since he spends a great deal of his time hobnobbing with members of the ethnic minorities and championing many of their causes!

The 'Nazi' jibe arises from the fact that there was a strong tendency in Hitler's Germany to oppose the formlessness of modern architecture and to favour a return to classicism. Many of the buildings in Germany of

When I am alone, I do not have the effrontery to consider myself an artist at all... I am only a clown, a mountebank. I have understood my time and I have exploited the imbecility of my contemporaries. Pablo Picasso

THE CLASSICAL
St. George's Hall,
Liverpool



THE MODERN
The hideous
panorama of
conemporary
Birmingham



that period bear the marks of a classical revival.

Anyway, we can only say that if being opposed to modernism in architecture

and favouring city designs in the traditional styles makes one a 'Nazi' there must be many millions of 'Nazis' around among the British public today!

ANOTHER DIKTAT FROM BRUSSELS

ONCE AGAIN, the European Community has tried to dictate to Britain over a matter of legislation that should be decided here, not on the Continent.


The Eurocrats have ordered us to compel all manufacturers of tobacco products to place a notice on their packets saying "Tobacco seriously damages your health," this coming into effect in 1992.

Actually, we do not believe such an idea to be wrong in itself. What is wrong is that the Eurocrats should be the ones to tell us to adopt it, instead of our deciding for ourselves.

If Europe is able to dictate to us to do the right things, it is only a matter of time before it starts to try to dictate to us to do the wrong things. The issue is not one of whether cigarette packets should

carry health warnings: the issue is whether the bosses of the Common Market should make Britain's laws. We say they shouldn't!

It is high time that Britain's political leaders told the Eurocrats to keep their noses out of our affairs.



The Market HQ in
Brussels (left)

The real reason for the crime explosion

FEW PEOPLE need telling that Britain's crime rate is now going through the roof. With 10,000 reported offences a day, lawbreaking is at record levels. The formerly ordered fabric of British society is simply falling apart.

A great deal of national heart-searching has greeted this unpleasant phenomenon, with Tories in particular lamenting its emergence. At every Conservative Party conference we hear loud calls for stiffer punishments to be handed out by the courts and for soft judges to be sacked. On the left of politics, on the other hand, there is more of an emphasis on the 'social' causes of crime: poverty, unemployment, disadvantages in education, 'racism', etc., etc., etc., ad nauseam.

While we totally reject these excuses for criminality bleated by lefties and liberals, we do share with grass-roots Conservatives the view that deterrents to crime are not strong enough and that far too many judges and magistrates seem to be afflicted with more sympathy for the criminal than for his victim. Certainly a much tougher system of penalties is called for. But this is not enough.

THE SOCIAL CONSCIENCE

The deterrent of strong punishment never has been the major factor that has kept people away from crime, for the simple reason that the vast majority of lawbreakers never expect to get caught. The main preventative to crime has always been the social and moral conscience of the vast majority of the population, enforced by a respect for society's institutions and the authorities that maintain them.

When such respect disappears, the individual conscience reacts accordingly. Society as a whole, from the top downwards, is seen as a jungle in which there are no rules, no moral conventions, no duties, no obligations of good citizenship. When it is seen that society's highest positions and national honours are heaped upon people who have

Any society has a right to preserve public peace and order, and therefore has a good right to prohibit the propagation of opinions which have a dangerous tendency. To say the magistrate has this right is using an inadequate word: it is the society for which the magistrate is agent. Dr. Samuel Johnson

rendered no service to the nation whatever, but have merely become successful by participating in the rat-race more ruthlessly and effectively than their fellows, the ordinary citizen is apt to say: "What is good for him is good for me; why should I play by the rules when those who have got to the top of the pile obviously do not?"

LOSS OF RESPECT

In any army, indiscipline, leading to anarchy and eventual mutiny, is always the product of bad generalship, generalship unable to command the respect of the troops.

Likewise in a nation, if it is clearly perceived that the political leadership is totally unworthy of respect, and that the institutions representing 'authority' are rotten to the core, the respect of the people for



WHERE THE BUCK STOPS
Britain's leaders are seen increasingly by the nation as people without morals or principles. This produces a national mood of cynicism and contempt for authority

laws and moral codes will diminish and crime will become rampant.

The answer to the crime wave, therefore, is not merely a toughening up of the penal system — though that is certainly necessary.

The ultimate answer is the installation of a new type of national political leadership and new institutions whereby authority is exercised.

In short, a revolution.

How many more murders, robberies, muggings and frauds will we have to suffer before this truth is recognised?

JEFFREY TURNER

Why are war widows going short when we can afford millions for the Third World?

WITH THE FALLING of Remembrance Day last month, the spotlight was put on the plight of Britain's war widows, whose pensions are wholly inadequate for them to maintain their heads above water in the inflationary economy with which the nation has been afflicted.

This is because of a ludicrous anomaly in the system of pension awards, whereby the widows of servicemen who died before March 31st 1973 (in other words all those who lost their lives in the two world wars) receive less than £70 a week, whereas those whose husbands died on active service after that date receive £148.50 — more than double.

The Government has refused to alter this gross inequality — on the grounds that a pension scheme should only apply to those who have contributed to it. But the older war widows reply by asking how their husbands could have paid into a pension scheme when they were dead.

But of course underlying the

Government's stingy attitude towards these widows is its desire to make economies in public expenditure. The money for the upgrading of world-war widows' pensions could only come out of the public purse, and drawings on the public purse, in the view of the Government, must be kept down.

But in the meantime the Government is still sanctioning the paying out of £1,300 million a year to the Third World!

PRIORITIES WRONG

To us, this seems like a ludicrous order of priorities.

It is also very noticeable how little we have heard in the way of protest about widows' pensions from the familiar bleeding-heart brigade who are always tugging at our consciences over the plight of the hungry overseas.

We say that it is a national scandal that the wives of those who died for their country in 1914-18 and 1939-45 should have to go short while there is plenty of money from



BRITAIN'S NEGLECTED ONES
A group of war widows attending a service on Remembrance Day last month. Many of these live on a pittance while 'liberals' and bleeding hearts urge us to send money to the Third World

Britain to line the pockets of Afro-Asian dictators.

A Nationalist Government would see to it that this scandal was brought to an end and the resources


of Britain devoted to catering for the needy of Britain — with elderly war widows near to the front of the queue.

MARK KELLY

"6.5 per-cent for you but 10 per-cent for us!"

WHILE the Government has put many innocent people's lives at risk by its refusal to go beyond the offer of a 6.5 per-cent pay rise for the ambulance workers, it has been only too glad to grant politicians a rise of as high as 10 per-cent — this including of course its own members!

The 10 per-cent rise was announ-



DEMONSTRATING FOR MORE PAY
The ambulance workers, seen above, currently perform far more essential services to the nation than MPs, yet they are refused the same upgrading of income

WOMEN TURNING AWAY FROM FEMINISM

IF there is one hopeful sign for the 1990s, beginning next month, it is that 'feminism' seems to be on its way out and that women in Britain are growing disenchanted with the idea of trying to be men. This is the finding of a report in the *Daily Mail*, published on November 17th. The report was taken from information obtained by the Henley Centre independent forecasting group.

According to the report, "Women are now beginning to recognise that they do not have to be like men. Instead they can be proud of being women and acknowledge differences between the sexes."

To any person with a modicum of intelligence, the idea that women or men could ever fail to recognise the difference between the sexes in the first place, and therefore have to learn about it by the experience of trying to deny it, is preposterous. However, such have been the fashionable idiocies promoted by the universities and the media over the last few decades that millions of women (and men) have actually fallen for this hoax.

LOW BIRTHRATE

One appalling consequence is that many women have abandoned belief in the virtues of domesticity and motherhood and have failed to produce enough children to maintain a healthy national birthrate. We are now beginning to see the disastrous results of this low birthrate in the dangerous shortages of young people now available for important jobs, particularly military service.

One woman who devoted many of the best years of her life to the pursuit of a career, to the neglect of her family, is Mrs. Cathy Gyngell, who has worked as an editor for a TV programme. She has spoken of her heartbreak at having to leave her baby each day to go to the TV studios. "Nobody," she said, "warned me of the terrible pang of separation. What have we done that motherhood has been so diminished that it is not even a conceivable option for the so-called intelligent or educated woman?"

Answer: What we have done, Mrs. Gyngell, is listened too long to the trendy liberals and 'progressives', who have sneered at a woman's home-making and mothering role, and left us a nation in which family life is breaking up and which cannot produce enough young



EX-CAREER WOMAN
Cathy Gyngell, seen here with her two sons

people to have a strong and prosperous future. What we have to do is turn our back on these counsellors of decadence and recognise again the importance of men and women fulfilling their traditional biological roles.

This does not mean that we have to close the career doors to those women who are determined on pursuing careers.

But it does mean that the career

woman should not be the national ideal to be encouraged among the majority of the population. It means that the heads of education and of the media should get their priorities right. If a few women want to make careers, let them. But let the majority be encouraged to be housewives and mothers first and foremost.

For if they are not, we will have no nation left in a few generations' time!

Who the hell do these people think they are?

DIANA, Lady Mosley, aged 79, is the widow of Sir Oswald Mosley, former leader of the British Union of Fascists. Some little while ago she was invited to be the guest on the radio programme *Desert Island Discs*, on which people pick recordings of their favourite music while talking between times about their lives and opinions.

The broadcast of the programme was to have taken place on September 17th but this was postponed, as the BBC received a protest from the Jewish community to the effect that the event coincided with one of their religious festivals.

There then followed two further months of delay and procrastination by the BBC, until the programme was eventually broadcast on Sunday, November 26th — to many hisses of disapproval from columnists in the press. Some 'anti-fascists' even were so idiotic as

to read some 'racist' undertone into Lady Mosley's choice of a song 'A whiter shade of pale', among the many classics.

Earlier on, the *Sunday Telegraph* writer 'Mandrake' had got in on the act and called for a definite cancellation of the programme. After detailing Lady Mosley's life, including of course her firm support for her late husband's political views and activities, he ended up by saying: "I hope that most readers will agree with me that the programme should not be broadcast."

We would like to ask Mr. 'Mandrake' and the leaders of the Jewish community: "Just who the hell do you think you are?" Lady Mosley's political views may be right or wrong — it is up to the listeners to judge when they hear what she has to say. But just since when has it been a rule that people are to be excluded from BBC channels on account of their political

THE CIRCUS GOES ON T.V.

THE WESTMINSTER CIRCUS, our name for the daily antics of the House of Commons, is now witnessed by the millions on their television screens. Is this a good or bad thing? There is much disagreement on that question.

Roger Scruton, writing in the *Sunday Telegraph* (November 19th) believes it a bad thing because it means that MPs, instead of devoting themselves to the seriousness of the debates, will be playing to a national audience of TV viewers. This, he said, can only be bad for democracy.

We think otherwise. We think it a good thing that the madhouse that is the Commons be exposed to everyone for what it is, for that may lead many to revise their views as to the usefulness of this absurd institution to the nation.

Jaguar: US take-over already turning sour for workforce

WHEN the American Ford Motor Company took over Jaguar recently, we were all assured that the deal would greatly benefit Jaguar's workers, among others. But it does not seem to be turning out that way.

Prior to the take-over, Jaguar's workers held £100 million in company shares. These they bought under a scheme which enabled them to save up to

£150 a month, deducted from pay, to buy shares in the company at 20 per-cent below market prices. By law, when such shares are held for five to seven years, subsequent profits are tax-free, but a sale before that time would let in the tax man for a cut of the workers' savings.

Now Fords are putting strong pressure on Jaguar's workers to sell these shares by offering a highly attractive 850p a share, and it has announced that it is going to scrap the workers' share scheme for the future. The holders feel that if they don't accept the Ford offer the share price will fall after the take-over has been completed.


This has caused considerable bitterness among Jaguar's workers, who were getting an extremely good deal under the old share scheme. Ford in fact want eventually to get 100 per-cent ownership of the company, and this is one step towards it.

When the Government abandoned its insistence on Jaguar remaining a British-owned company and opened the door to the take-over by Ford, it did surely have known of this plan, but it did not disclose that knowledge to Jaguar's workers. This amounts to a quite cynical piece of deceit and betrayal.

LADY MOSLEY
Why should she not be treated the same as anyone else?



opinions? Lady Mosley never in her life committed any crime. The idea that she should not now be allowed onto a programme such as *Desert Island Discs* just because her views are unpopular in certain quarters is a mockery of the very thing our servicemen are supposed to have fought for during the last war: the freedom of people — all people — to express what opinions they choose.




HIS MASTER'S VOICE

Ulster Secretary Brooke's hint about 'talks' with Sinn Fein reflects Government attitude of defeatism, weakness and surrender

EARLY LAST MONTH, Mrs. Thatcher's latest appointee as Secretary for Ulster, Peter Brooke, flashed a clear message to the republican gangsters of the province that the Government's will to defend its British status and the lives and security of the loyal majority of its population is now weaker than ever before.

In his first major press conference since being kicked upstairs to the Northern Ireland Office by the Prime Minister after proving himself a washout as Tory Party Chairman, Brooke



BROOKE
He only said what his Westminster bosses are clearly thinking

out of the bag about the direction in which it leading — in other words, speaking too bluntly and openly about what the Government is really thinking. Indeed, one senior Whitehall official admitted that Brooke had in fact said "nothing new."

In fact, confabs between British cabinet ministers and leading IRA gangsters and their supporters have been going on for years. Back in 1972 William Whitelaw, then Ulster Secretary, had a cosy get-together with some of these thugs. His Labour successor Merlyn Rees did likewise in 1975. Then in 1985 Douglas Hurd repeated the trick in a clandestine meeting with the IRA's so-called 'Chief of Staff', Martin McGuinness.

The only thing that has changed is that Brooke now wants to chit-chat with the murderers of some 3,000 and more Britons in an open and official affair, instead of keeping it in the closet.

That this is true is indicated by the Government's signing of the Anglo-Irish Agreement, which amounts to a tacit acknowledgement that Ulster is the business of the Irish Republic and gives the IRA and Sinn Fein at least half of what they are aiming for, with the implicit promise that if they go on bombing and killing for long enough in the future they will get the rest.

Only a very short time after Brooke's fatuous statement, the IRA struck again, bombing an army Staff Sergeant, Andrew Mudd, as he was in his car with his wife in the Colchester area. Staff Sgt.



THE AFTERMATH
This is the wreckage of the car belonging to Staff Sergeant Andrew Mudd, which was blown up by an IRA bomb a short while after Brooke's fatuous statement about the Government talking to the murderers. Staff Sgt. Mudd lost both legs in the explosion and his wife, with him at the time, was badly injured. This kind of atrocity reflects the encouragement given to the IRA by Brooke's defeatist talk

Mudd lost both legs in the bombing, while his wife was seriously wounded too. Another leading Ulster Unionist politician, Mr. Jim Nicholson, said, in connection with this latest outrage, that Brooke has "blood on his hands." This was a clear echo of the belief of many unionists that the Ulster Secretary's pathetic confession of Government impotence had provided direct encouragement to the bombers to step up their campaign — as they had obviously got the Government rattled and on the run.

The true facts of the matter is that

Britain will not buy peace from her republican enemies by offering to give them what they want if only they will stop their terrorism. The record proves it.

Weakness and surrender will only stir these and other enemies to further outrages — and in this world Britain has no shortage of such enemies, whether in Ulster, on her own mainland or abroad. A strong stand in Ulster is vital to our future everywhere in the world where it is at stake.

JOHN MORSE

The war that Britain could easily win if she wanted

CONTRARY to what Ulster Secretary Peter Brooke may say about Britain's alleged inability to defeat the IRA, this gang could in fact easily be wiped out tomorrow — if the Government really had the desire and the will to carry the operation through.

This much is plain from a recent interview given to *The Sun* newspaper by a senior army spokesman. Described as an intelligence officer, the spokesman confirmed that the security forces could, if so ordered, quite easily put paid to the IRA's entire command structure.

Britain's intelligence services have built up a highly efficient machinery of surveillance. They know the identities and whereabouts of all the main 'godfathers' of republican terrorism. This process could very readily be taken to its logical conclusion by sending in the SAS to eliminate virtually the entire terrorist hierarchy.

Said the spokesman: "It would be a relatively simple assignment."

The only objections of a military nature that he raised were two in number: firstly that it is desirable to take prisoners for the sake of the information they may yield under interrogation; secondly that the terrorist rank and file might go to ground if their leaders were wiped out.

To the first objection, it need only be said that with the kind of expertise possessed by the SAS that body could as easily be sent in as snatch squads as they could as execution squads, where this was thought necessary for intelligence-gathering reasons. To the second objection, it can only be said that it would be preferable to have the terrorists hiding their heads in fear rather than publicly flaunting themselves and their weapons on the streets of Londonderry and Belfast, as they did during the republican funeral procession in the latter city last year which ended with the brutal lynching of two army corporals. And in any event, with the leaders of the IRA wiped out or otherwise put out of commission the rank and file would suffer an enormous blow by being deprived of their operational heads — and if new men from the rank and file came forward to replace the existing leaders it would not take long before their identities and whereabouts would also be known to the security forces, so that they in turn could be dealt with by whatever summary methods were necessary.

POLITICAL COWARDICE

All this having been said, it is nevertheless clear that the real reason for the failure of the

WE COULD WIPE OUT THE IRA TOMORROW BUT WE WON'T

Sun news special
The British Army could blast the IRA's top 50 commanders off the face of the Earth—NOW.
Through detailed surveillance checks, security chiefs know exactly WHO use top Provos are, WHERE they live and WHAT clothes they move in.
Teams of SAS snipe squads could be sent to Belfast and Dublin to snipe every one quickly and efficiently.
The IRA would have a horrendous field day.

THE TRUTH (FOR ONCE) FROM THE SUN
A cut-out of the headline in the exposing of the Government's claim that we cannot smash the IRA

authorities to take the action that easily could be taken against the IRA lies elsewhere. The major obstacle to such an operation is not tactical but political. The security forces' hands are tied by their political masters, and no political will exists whereby such an operation could be sanctioned.

Last September, an army staff sergeant's wife, Mrs. Heidi Hazell, was brutally murdered in West Germany by a terrorist thug armed with a Soviet-made assault rifle. The IRA gleefully claimed responsibility for this unspeakable murder.

In the aftermath, the editor of another Tory tabloid, the *Daily Star*, urged Mrs. Thatcher directly, in a signed leading article, to issue the orders necessary to exterminate the IRA for good. Said the editor, Brian Hitchen: "There is only one way to fight terrorists — with terror. A terror so great that these psychopaths will shudder at the very thought of the men who are coming for them. You (i.e. the Prime Minister) have the means (the SAS). Use them."

But according to *The Sun's* informant, Mrs. Thatcher has no stomach for this. The 'Iron Lady' of Tory myth is too squeamish to pay out the republican butchers of British soldiers and civilians in their own coin. In her view, this would be "fighting terrorism with terrorism," which, according to her, Britain cannot do.

Among other things, the Prime Minister is said to be hag-ridden with fears that, in the course of any such operation, there is an outside chance of some innocent bystander possibly being injured or killed accidentally by our own security forces.

It can only be said in reply that by her not ordering such an operation it is a racing certainty that a great many more innocent

Britons are definitely going to suffer mutilation and death.

But above all the prime Minister is terrified of the republican propaganda machine. She is frightened that if she started to fight the IRA seriously this might stir up all sorts of foreign opinion against herself and her Government.

So out of sheer gutlessness Mrs. Thatcher has opted to fall back on the shameful formula that has become established as the official Whitehall and Westminster line, under governments of all political stripes, for the past 20 years. In the eyes of Britain's rulers, republican terrorists cannot be defeated but can only be 'contained', and their acts of murder and mayhem can be allowed to continue as long as they do not go beyond an 'acceptable level'.

By these means, Mrs. Thatcher hands the initiative all the time to Britain's enemies.

HOIST ON HIS OWN PETARD?

ROY HATTERSLEY, Labour MP for Birmingham (Sparkbrook), has spent his whole political life currying favour with Britain's ethnic minorities — no great surprise when it is realised that they form a huge part of his local constituency. Now, however, his seat is threatened by a black activist, Martha Osamor, who says she is going to try to oust him as he was one of those who opposed her being adopted as candidate at the by-election in Vauxhall. It couldn't have happened to a better fellow!


'Hatters', seen here at a party after a few drinks. He won't be wearing the same smile if he loses his parliamentary seat

YOU WON'T BELIEVE THIS — LATEST BOMB VICTIM WAS GERRY ADAMS' BODYGUARD!

FOLLOWING shortly on from news of the appalling injuries suffered by Staff Sergeant Mudd in the IRA Colchester bomb, there came the extraordinary revelation that Staff Sgt. Mudd, some years ago when a young corporal, was ordered to carry out protection duty to prevent Gerry Adams, the Sinn Fein chief, being assassinated!

Adams had then just come to prominence, and security chiefs in Ulster feared that he would be a prime target for loyalist paramilitary groups.

Said a colleague of the sergeant: "He may well have foiled an attempt to kill Gerry Adams — and now Adams and his henchmen do this



ADAMS
His pals maimed the man who protected him

to him and his wife." This was a reference to the bomb that was planted on Staff Sgt. Mudd's car and which caused him to lose both his legs following the explosion, as well as badly injuring Mrs. Mudd.

This kind of gratitude is of course exactly what we should expect from garbage like the IRA and Sinn Fein.

The matter, however, opens up another question: just what were the security forces doing employing the resources and manpower of the British state to put a guard on Adams in order to protect his life? If Adams was under threat from loyalist gunmen, then the security forces (with the full approval of the Government) should have let him get the justice at the hands of those people that he deserved. It would have been one more public nuisance out of Britain's way and without the nation's authorities even having to dirty their hands in getting involved.

A nation which employs its own troops to protect the skins of its enemies, as is indicated in this case, must clearly be off its head and fit only to earn the contempt of the world.

For us, no level of slaughter of British people by their enemies can ever be 'acceptable'. And enemies of Britain are there to be fought and beaten, not 'contained'. And what foreigners may think of such a policy is of no account, as far as we are concerned.

J.M.



SPREADING THE WORD

Items available
from the
BNP Bookshop

154 Upper Wickham Lane
Welling
Kent DA16 3DP

Telephone: 01 316 4721

Open Tuesdays to Fridays, 10 a.m. to 5.30 p.m.



RECORDINGS

B.N.P. RECORDINGS

Rally '87: Video-recording of BNP London rally in October 1987. Speeches by John Tyndall, Ian Sloan, Gus McLeod, Dr. Peter Peel, Richard Edmonds, David Bruce and Stanley Clayton-Garnett.

Rally '82: Sound recording of the BNP London rally in October 1982.

Tyndall Speaks I: Sound-recorded talks on racial heritage and economic crisis.

Tyndall Speaks II: Sound-recorded talks on nationalism and World War II.


Tyndall Speaks III: Sound-recorded talks on repatriation and the national community.

Tyndall Speaks IV: Sound-recorded talks on unemployment and the racial time-bomb.

Video: £15 plus 71p p&p.
Sound: £3.50 plus 28p p&p.



B.N.P. STICKERS



OUTLAW
HOMOSEXUALITY!




As more unemployment rolls off the boats, we say...
BAN IMPORTS!



Free speech is under attack -
DEFEND IT!
Mentions prosecutions and bans against nationalists



Protect our women and old folk
STAMP OUT MUGGERS!




Protect our young from child murderers...
BRING BACK THE ROPE!




Support Ulster
Smash terrorism
HANG I.R.A. MURDERERS!



Fight subversion
SMASH COMMUNISM!



Stickers measure
3 1/2 in x 2 1/2 in. Self-
adhesive at £1.50
per 100; gummed
back at 40p per
100. Postage
costs 26p per 100.



Oppose the disarmers
build up our forces
MAKE BRITAIN STRONG



LOVE THE WHITE RACE
Protect its future!



Scrap the Anglo-Irish
Agreement
KEEP ULSTER BRITISH!



CND are Moscow's puppets
Don't be fooled by them
KEEP BRITAIN'S BOMB!



Save our cities from this (riot)...
START REPATRIATION!



ABORTION IS
CHILD MURDER
MAKE IT ILLEGAL!



She freezes in Winter while
Third World gets £1,000 million
a year
PUT BRITISH PEOPLE
BEFORE ALIENS!

B.N.P. MERCHANDISE

STOP
IMMIGRATION!
START
REPATRIATION!
BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY
PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW

BNP

EVERY VOTE COUNTS
VOTE
BRITISH
NATIONAL
PARTY
P.O. BOX 446 LONDON SE23 2LS

BNP

OUR COUNTRY
LOVE IT
OR LOSE IT!
BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY
PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW


BNP

HANG
CONVICTED
TERRORIST
MURDERERS
BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY
P.O. BOX 446 LONDON SE23 2LS

BNP

HONG KONG CHINESE?
NO
ROOM
HERE!
BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY
PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW


BNP



STICKERS


Six more popular stickers from the BNP. These red-on-white self-adhesive stickers can be yours for just £1.00 a roll, plus 28p p&p

BOOKS



Churchill's War, by David Irving. Savage exposure by the world's most popular revisionist historian of Winston Churchill. Working as usual from primary source material, Irving reveals a man far removed from popular mythology. As Irving demonstrates, Churchill played a major role in the destruction of the very British Empire he claimed to be fighting to save. 591 pages. Hardback. £16.95 plus £2.00 p&p.

THE BIOLOGY of the RACE PROBLEM




Biology of the Race Problem, by Wesley C. George. Well documented but easily understood presentation of the facts of heredity in race. Explains how the Caucasian (White) is 200,000 years ahead of the Negro in evolutionary development and why race-mixing should be avoided. 72 pages. £1.00 plus 28p p&p.

T-SHIRTS & POSTERS



FIGHTING for race+nation

Get this exciting new black-on-white design T-shirt or A2-size poster. T-shirts only £5 plus 28p p&p. Posters £1.50 inc. p&p. Send cheques or POs to PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW. If ordering T-shirt, remember to state shirt size.



HOW THE FESTIVAL OF REMEMBRANCE HAS BEEN TURNED INTO A FESTIVAL OF HUMBUG

While the fighters for 'freedom' are saluted, the reality of freedom is buried

IN THE MORNING of Sunday, November 12th, thousands of now elderly men and women stood in dignified silence on the site of the London Cenotaph, remembering those who gave their lives in two world wars. As has been customary during the past years in which this ceremony has been enacted, the word 'freedom' was much in everyone's mind. Inscriptions on war memorials up and down the country hallow those who died for 'freedom'. Church services everywhere on the same day of remembrance recall the sacrifice for 'freedom'. At the annual gathering at London's Albert Hall the same theme was much to the fore. The wars of 1914-18 and 1939-45 were fought, above everything else, in defence of 'freedom'.

Barely more than an hour after the conclusion of the London Cenotaph ceremony, groups of members and supporters of the British National Party arrived on the outskirts of York, where the party had intended to lay a wreath on the local war memorial and subsequently stage an outdoor rally — both also in salute to Britain's and the Dominions' war dead. They were met there by large detachments of police, and curtly told that their rally had been banned, that they may not proceed into the city unless they wished to be arrested and that they should do a quick about-turn and journey back to whence they came. In the case of one party coming from nearby Leeds, a strong police escort accompanied the party back to that city to ensure that those in it abided by the police order.

We repeat — this took place in the vicinity of York, capital of the British county of Yorkshire — not East Berlin, not Prague, not Bucharest, not Moscow. The people stopped by police from holding their wreath-laying ceremony and rally were British people, not East Germans, not Czechs, not Roumanians, not Russians. This was Great Britain 1989 — an apt occasion to mark the 50th

year after the outbreak of the war fought in defence of 'freedom' in 1939.

And what was the pretext for the banning of the BNP ceremony and rally in York? It was the pretext of preserving 'public order'. But it was not the BNP that was a threat to public order; it was a gang of left-wing trouble-makers who, on the announcement some weeks before that the BNP would be coming to York, decided to assemble there for the purpose of stopping the BNP engaging in its lawful assembly. By all rational calculation, any police action taken to prevent people's entry into York should therefore have been taken against this assemblage of left-wingers, and not

"*Enoch Powell once caused consternation by saying that he would fight for England even if it had a communist government. He meant that one does not fight for principles but for country. The men who fell fighting for their country, whom we recall today, Remembrance Sunday, died not because they were for democracy or against fascism, but simply pro patria. With the approach of 1992, this may be one of the last Remembrance Sundays that we mark in the old spirit.*"

JOHN CASEY
Sunday Telegraph, November 12th

against the BNP. The latter were going to York to engage in a lawful and peaceful activity; the former were going there for the unlawful purpose of using violent means to prevent them doing so. Yet in the cause of 'public order' it was the BNP that was stopped, on the day, from entering York and threatened with arrest. And the left-wing mobsters? Why, they were allowed to proceed into York and hold their own anti-BNP rally, then to engage in a procession through the city to lay their own wreath on the local war memorial — despite an order from the Home Secretary made shortly beforehand banning all public processions in the area on the day.

In the meantime, not only were the BNP members and supporters stopped entering the city, many of them were subjected to police searches of their persons and vehicles, as if they were common criminals.

These events at York on November 12th were in fact only the most prominent tip of an iceberg of state repression of British patriots that has manifested itself increasingly in recent years, and in particular in the present year, when the party has had to contend with police tactics not dissimilar in Bradford and Birmingham, where, although public assemblies were permitted, they were forced to take place under circumstances that made it quite impossible for there to be any attendance by the ordinary public to whom the events had been advertised.

It is for all these reasons that readers will perhaps understand if we of the British National Party do not display quite the same respectfulness and reverence towards the concept of Remembrance Day as do others in this country. We certainly salute the brave men (and women) who gave their lives

BNP sub renewals due!

British National Party members are reminded that all subscriptions become due for renewal at the end of this month.



REPUTED TO HAVE FOUGHT FOR OUR FREEDOM
Veterans of World War II line up at the Cenotaph in London on Remembrance Day last month

in the two great world wars of this century, and we most certainly honour their memory. But we can only regard with contempt and loathing the system for which so many of them, without knowing it, died. Today in 1989 that system becomes exposed, more than ever before, for the corrupt fraud and

the worship of the false gods of 'freedom' and 'liberty', behind which lurk the agents of slavery — now busily engaged in clamping ever tighter irons on the nation which honoured its dead on November 12th.

But if the events of that day in York this year did anything to us it was to



WHAT FREEDOM?
Police stop BNP London party on outskirts of York to order them to keep out of city. Tall figure on left in foreground is Richard Edmonds

racket that it is. And the festival of remembrance becomes nothing better than a festival of humbug, organised for

harden our resolve to fight, as our war veterans believed they were fighting, to make Britain truly free.

TWO NEW GROUPS FORMED

HILLINGDON

At a recent meeting in Hillingdon, in West London, 20 people gathered to hear National Organiser David Bruce give a well-delivered presentation of the case for the BNP and of the need for everyone to become involved in the struggle to build a mass movement to win back Britain.

Following this, a highly successful 'Day of Action' was held in the area on November 18th, which was supported by outside activists.

The formation of Hillingdon BNP is a welcome step forward for the party in an area that has not seen any organised nationalist activity for some time.

LAMBETH

A welcome addition to BNP strength in South London has been made recently with the formation of a Lambeth Group. Lambeth, taking in as it does the notorious Stockwell/Brixton/Clapham triangle, is an area where activities need some courage to take part in. For routine leafletting, strength in numbers will be needed. Therefore, while numbers are small Organiser Eddie Stanton is gearing up activities with a concentration on stickering and posterings.

What about your area?

Are you frustrated because you want to help the BNP actively but find no unit in your area? Never mind — you can start one. All you need is to spend a few pounds on a selection of literature, and then put it out — all on your own. Write for details to the address on the right.

What we stand for

- An end to party warfare in Britain and the establishment of a government of national unity, with a parliament elected by occupational franchise
- British withdrawal from the European Common Market
- Termination of the multi-racial Commonwealth but preservation of the White Commonwealth
- Protection of British industry by the selective exclusion of foreign manufactured goods from Britain; the creation of full employment by the building up of domestic industries to produce goods to replace those now imported
- A sane financial system that will give the people the purchasing power to buy the goods they produce
- Massive regeneration of British farming, so as to enable the nation to achieve much greater self-sufficiency in food production
- British ownership and control of British industry and resources
- An end to immigration and a start to repatriation of ethnic minorities
- A massive switch of overseas aid to helping the needy at home
- The strengthening of Britain's defences, including restoration of national service
- Tougher treatment of criminals, including the return of the death penalty
- The smashing of the IRA, the termination of the Anglo-Irish Agreement and firm support for the loyalist majority in Northern Ireland
- A great national effort to restore traditional moral values, aimed at strengthening the family and recreating the fabric for a sound and healthy social order

WRITE TO US

To: British National Party, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW
(Tick appropriate box):

Please send me more information, for which I enclose 30p ☐

I wish to become a member and enclose the yearly fee of £12 (half-rate for OAPs and students) ☐

Name.....
Address.....

Contact your local party unit!

THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY is organised into active units extending over most of the areas of the United Kingdom. Below we give a list of the main units:-

NORTH WEST LONDON
BM Box 3958, London WC1N 3XX

EAST LONDON
PO Box 300, Emma Street, Hackney, London E2 7BZ

SOUTH LONDON
PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW

WEST KENT
PO Box 48, Tonbridge TN11 9JF

EAST KENT
73 Shirkoak Park, Woodchurch, Ashford

EPHING FOREST
PO Box 12, Loughton, Essex IG10 3BU

SUFFOLK
2 Albert Road, Framlingham

NORFOLK
9 Johnson Place, Norwich NR2 2SA

SOUTH WALES
PO Box 214, Cardiff CF3 9YB

BIRMINGHAM
PO Box 771, Great Barr, Birmingham B44 9LZ

LEICESTER
PO Box 148, Leicester LE3 2YD

LIVERPOOL
PO Box 116, Liverpool L69 1SH

MANCHESTER & SALFORD
PO Box 16, Salford M6 5EP

LEEDS & BRADFORD
PO Box BR10, Bramley, Leeds 13

HUDDERSFIELD
PO Box A43, Huddersfield HD1 4NN

WAKEFIELD
PO Box 101, Wakefield WF2 9XY

DONCASTER
PO Box 73, Doncaster DN4 6BS

SHEFFIELD
PO Box 44, Sheffield S1 1ES

DARLINGTON
PO Box 61, Darlington Co. Durham DL3 9RD

TYNE & WEAR
PO Box 8, South Shields NE33 1LP

GLASGOW
PO Box 85, Glasgow G3 8UL

The BNP also has units in Gloucestershire, Hertfordshire, Bedford, Cambridge, Brierley Hill (West Midlands), Nottingham, North Nottinghamshire, Bolton & Bury, Warrington, Blackpool, Hull, Halifax, Dewsbury, Batley, York, Sunderland, Edinburgh, Dundee, Aberdeen and Inverness. If you want to make contact with any of these units, or start a new unit, please write to BNP Head Office at PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

NEW BUILDING FUND: £2,282.00 NEEDED!

Contributions to the BNP New Building Fund over the last month have totalled £195. This is a big improvement on the previous month. We now need £2,282.00 to meet our target. The money is urgently needed to meet building costs.

Please send all contributions to New Building Fund, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW. Please give generously!

You are invited to join a housing co-operative. Need help? Want to help? Write to: Housing, BM Box 3958, London WC1N 3XX

SPEARHEAD

For an in-depth view of nationalist politics, read *Spearhead*, a 20-page monthly magazine which supports the British National Party. Price 60p. Yearly subscription £10.50. 84p for sample copy to: *Spearhead*, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

BUY BRITISH NATIONALIST IN BULK

British Nationalist retails at 25p from your local seller. Would bulk-purchasers order only in the quantities listed below. Standing orders welcomed

| | | |
|--------------|---------|---------------|
| 10 copies | £2.50 | + 70p post |
| 25 copies | £5.50 | + £2.30 post |
| 50 copies | £10.00 | + £2.85 post |
| 100 copies | £17.50 | + £3.30 post |
| 150 copies | £25.00 | + £3.80 post |
| 200 copies | £30.00 | + £4.20 post |
| 300 copies | £42.00 | + £5.50 post |
| 400 copies | £55.00 | + £5.50 post |
| 500 copies | £65.00 | + Bulk rates |
| 1,000 copies | £125.00 | + by Roadline |

Cheques/postal orders to British Nationalist, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW. Please keep orders and enquiries concerning British Nationalist totally separate from other correspondence in order to avoid delay and confusion.

SUBSCRIBE!

In order to make sure of receiving *British Nationalist* regularly, why not take out a subscription? The rate is £5.15 for 12 issues to subscribers in the British Isles and £7.00 (unsealed surface mail) for subscribers overseas. Please make cheques/POs payable to *British Nationalist* and send them to: PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

An additional charge of £5.50 is required on all foreign currency cheques and POs and an additional £2 on all foreign currency sent in banknotes.

Name.....

Address.....